INDEX

of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
KAMEYAMA, Kazuji (resumed)	29392
(Witness stood down)	29393
NODA, Kengo (recalled)	29394
Direct by Mr. Lazarus Direct (cont'd) by Mr. Cole	29394 29397
Cross by Mr. Sutton	29398
(Witness excused)	29402
TANAKA, Ryukichi (recalled)	29406
Direct by Mr. Lazarus	29406
Cross by Mr. Sutton	29415
(Witness excused)	29418
KAMEYAMA, Kazuji (resumed)	29419
MORNING RECESS .	29421
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	29430
(Witness excused)	29433
	29475
KUWASHIMA, Kazue (recalled)	29475
Direct by Mr. Yamaoka Cross by Mr. Blakeney	29494

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.E	In Cvidenc
2616	3205-A		Certificate of First Demobilization Bure	au	29402
2614	3205-B		Sworn Statement of KANZAKI, Masayoshi		29403
2637	3233		Affidavit of TANAKA, Ryukichi		29407
2464	3234		Affidavit of KAMEYAMA Kazuji (Paragraphs 1, 9 and 10)	.,	29426
	3235		Pamphlet entitled "Co lection of the Publ cations in Connect: with the Negotiation for the Purchase of North Manchuria Ras	ion on:	
2509	3235-	1	Excerpt therefrom	1	29435
			NOON RECESS		29443
206-B(2)	3236		First Interview with Foreign Minister HIROTA - Excerpt from Diary of Form U. S. Ambassador G (page 99)	er	29447
2017	3237		Address by HIROTA as Minister Foreign A at the 65th Session the Imperial Diet January 1934	on of	29451

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident	In Eviden
2152	3238		Minutes of the Pro- ceedings of the Hou of Peers at the 65t Session of the Impe Diet on 7 February 1934 - Answer of th Minister of State, HIROTA, Koki	h rial	29462
1365	3239		Contents of the Person Message of the Japa Foreign Minister to American Secretary State, dated 21st February 1934	nese	29468
206-B(13)	3240		The Soviet Ambassador sets the Spring of 1934 as Decisive, of 9 March 1934		2947
			AFTERNOON RECESS		2947€
2145	3241		Affidavit of KUWASHI Kazue	MA,	29481

Friday, 26 September 1947 1 hart in mor in tagolog. 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal 5 War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 6 the arity of the Provider to the recountry 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 30 this morning. We will only take a t 0930. polisys, and I respectfully 10 the witness of yesterday say be allowed 11 Appearances: For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with 12 the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member 13 from India, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE 14 JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China and HOW RABLE JUSTICE E. H. NORTHCORFT, Merber. from 16 the Dominion of New Zealand, not sitting from 1330 to 17 18 1600. For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 19 For the Defense Section, same as before. 20 21 (English to Japanese and Japanese 22 to English interpretation was made by the 23 Language Section, IMTFE.) 24 PRINTERS: How long will there wetter a 25

I were tota, Mr. Lamarus?

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

KAZUJI KAMEYAMA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, the remaining few matters for General HATA's individual phase had been set for 9:30 this morning. We will only take a few minutes, sir, I believe, and I respectfully request that the witness of yesterday may be allowed to step down so that we may finish, if that is agreeable to the Tribunal; or we will bring in this matter at any time that the Tribunal directs, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: We will take this witness' evidence first.

MR. LAZARUS: All right, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear Mr. Yamacka's reply.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. Yamaoka, sir, is not in court, but he will be here in one moment. Apparently, he did believe that we would go on first, sir. He will be here in a matter of seconds.

THE PRESIDENT: How long will these matters of yours take, Mr. Lazarus?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. LAZARUS: We have gone over it with Mr. Sutton, sir; so we believe fifteen or twenty minutes at the most, sir. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The witness will stand dom while you put those matters. ("hereupon, the witness was stood down.) MR. LAZARUS: Thank you, sir. If the Tribunal please, we offer in evidence exhibit 3202, which is an approved translation as revised by Major Moore. This will be the affidavit of NODA, Kengo. will been with the common to the wall and the second reading the u. S. to success Bergers Brill as the Windows . I then then full tenth head that the elimination the extense of the Johnson Staff, and I becauted tolks

with the Paint interest ton, thental Brant of Miles

where I desired that become the their practing was held

THE COLUMN THE PROPERTY WAS AND TO SERVE THE PARTY OF THE

KENGO. NODA, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oath.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. LAZARUS: The witness had identified his
Japanese copy, sir, and it had been given an exhibit
number. I will now proceed to read the approved
translation, sir. With the President's permission I
shall begin with paragraph 3 and omit the formal parts.

Cabinet, as I was Chief of the Personnel Affairs Bureau. I used the most scrupulous care and attention in recommending the man to succeed General HATA as War Minister.

I took into full consideration the views prevalent in the various bureaus of the War Ministry and the wishes of the General Staff, and I consulted fully with the Vice-Minister of War, General ANAMI. After all these consultations and after a thorough-going study I decided that under the then existing circumstances Lieutenant General TOJO was suitable, and I, as Chief of the Personnel Bureau, recommended him to war Minister HATA as the succeeding War Minister.

There were others who were considered for the position of new War Minister, but they were already in other important positions and it was difficult to effect a speedy transfer.

"Lieutenant General TOJO, on the other hand, was in Tokyo, holding the position of Inspector-General of the Air Force, and he had formerly been Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau and of the Maintenance Bureau. Further, he had once been the Vice-Minister of War in the HIRANUMA Cabinet. I considered him a suitable military administrator and it was the feeling in army circles that no one except Lieutenant General TOJO would do, so under these circumstances I recommended him as the succeeding War Minister. In accordance with this recommendation, General HATA submitted the name of General TOJO to the Three Chiefs' Conference held on 18 July 1940. The three thiefs after conference were unanimous in recommending Lieutenant General TOJO as succeeding War Minister. My recommendation of General TOJO, and General HATA's submitting the name of General TOJO to the Three Chiefs! Conference was in accordance with the standing procedure for such matters in the War Ministry. As a matter of fact, neither War Minister HATA nor I had any personal relations with Lieutenant General TOJO

20

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

in the past nor any intimate relations with him." in Cortonia Shrape araberations THE STEEL AND A TOWN IN THE PARTY OF THE PAR SW ME. CASES Q . To. White to, we could be the become Tions a samparand with ontinat man a section of the Acre you every el any repaided by attrespt this the Man Manualty to discredit Asserts Mark the A Property of the second selection of the first of in Ministract Black of Miles on the State States of Section

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

9

11

12

13 14

15

17

18

19

21

23

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Your Honor, I have a few questions on further direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Appearing for?

MR. COLE: For Ceneral MUTO, sir.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. COLE: Guneral MINO was Chief of the Military

Q Mr. Witness, as Chief of the Personnel
Affairs Bureau, did you have, among other duties, the
responsibility of observing and reporting on how army
officers performed their duties?

A Yes. w twice Comeral WITO approximed me

Q And during your tenure in that office, do
you recall whether any officer in the War Ministry
was ever punished for opposition to orders or policies
of General HATA?

law A . No. , to the light of the situation or cir-

Q Were you aware of any movement or attempt within the War Ministry to discredit General HATA or to oppose his policies?

A I never observed anything of the kind.

Q Now, then, in case of an imminent change of War Ministers, did the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau have any right to voice his opinion?

A I do not think the Chief of the Military

Affairs Bureau had any such right. Did you serve as Chief of the Personnel Affairs Bureau also under War Minister TOJO? A Yes, for about nine months. During that period, who was Chief of the 5 Military Affairs Bureau? 6 Major General MUTO was Chief of the Military 7 8 Affairs Bureau. I will ask you, Mr. Witness, whether you 9 recall, during that period, any special request that 10 11 was made to you by General MUTO? 12 Once or twice General MUTO approached me 13 informally, expressing his desire to resign from his 14 position. 15 Q Was any action taken by you in that connection? 16 A No steps were taken because it was not con-17 sidered proper in the light of the situation or cir-18 cumstances then existing, to permit a person to resign 19 at his own request. 20 MR. COLE: Thank you, sir. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton. 22 MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal. 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION 24

25

BY MR. SUTTON:

Who were the members of the Three Chiefs!

Conference which selected General TOJO as War Minister to succeed General HATA?

A At that time the War Minister was, of course, General HATA; the Chief of the Army General Staff. Prince KANIN; and the Inspector General of Military Training was General YAMADA.

Was General HATA required to recommend to the Three Chiefs' Conference the name submitted to him by you as Chief of the Personnel Affairs Bureau?

The name recommended by me was submitted by General HATA to the Three Chiefs' Conference.

My question was, did HATA, the retiring War Minister, have authority to recommend for appointment as the new War Minister, some person other than the person suggested by you? You may answer the question yes or no.

A Yes.

When were you asked by General HATA to suggest the name of someone to succeed him as War Minister?

I think it was immediately after War Minister HATA tendered his resignation.

Were you requested by General HATA at any time prior to the resignation of the YONAI Cabinet to suggest the name of a person to succeed him as War Minister?

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

24

25

A No.
Q Did not Premier YONAI ask War Minister HATA,
when HATA resigned as War Minister on 16 July, to
recommend someone to be the next War Minister?
A That I do not know.
Q And did not War Minister HATA reply that the
successor would be decided in the Three Chiefs' Con-
ference?
A That I do not know.
Q And did not HATA later the same day, 16 July
1940, report to Premier YONAI that there was no man
who would be the successor to the post?
A He did not say anything of the kind to me.
Q Did he make that statement to Premier YONAI?
A I am not familiar, nor do I have any knowledge
of such matters.
Q Did not this failure of the War Minister HATA
to recommend a successor cause the fall of the YONAI
Cabinet?
A Having had no relations with such matters,
I do not know.
Q Was General HATA very desirous that TOJO
should be appointed as War Minister to succeed him?

The fact of the matter is just this. I

expressed my views recommending General TOJO as

	10073473
	S
1	
36	W
2	
2	
5500	
3	
	ř
4	
ES AL	F
5	
00000	
6	
0	
190	
7	
520	
8	200
55080	233
9	
1000	
10	333
10	3 75
11	
11	1225
12	
13	2000
	GREEN.
14	300
1000	623
15	C. C.
10	100
	158
16	
	1500
17	3223
18	1000
	10.34
19	375
19	200
00	1
20	138
	1300
21	1000

24

25

succeeding War Minister, and General HATA merely agreed with my recommendation.

Q. Did not General HATA, before KONOYE formed his cabinet, go to the Emperor and recommend to the Emperor that TOJO be appointed as War Minister?

A I do not know about that.

Q And was not this done secretly by War Minister
HATA at that time?

A I do not think anything was done secretly.

Q And did not the Emperor state that he thought the procedure wrong because Prince KONOYE was still in the midst of forming his cabinet and had not accepted General TOJO for the post?

A I do not know.

Q And did not the Emperor state that he considered the action of War Minister HATA in secretly recommending TOJO as his successor as being over hasty and out of order?

A I am hearing such matters for the first time now. I do not know.

MR SUTTON: Your Honor, the last four questions are based upon the excerpt from KIDO's Diary which appears as exhibit 539, record 6266.

That concludes cross-examination of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus. MR. LAZARUS: No further questions, sir. May the witness be dismissed on the usual terms? THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. LAZARUS: We next offer in evidence, if the Tribunal please, defense document 2616. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2616 10 will receive exhibit No. 3205-A. 11 (Whereupon, the document above 12 referred to was marked defense exhibit 13 No. 3205-A and received in evidence.) 14 MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "Certificate of 15 First Demobilization Bureau. "I am the Section Chief of Documents in the 17 First Demobilization Bureau and hereby certify that 19 after searching for the letter which was sent in July 1940 from Chief of General Staff, Prince KANIN, to War Minister HATA, Shunroku, it could not be found in 21 the files of the First Lemobilization Bureau. "Date, 23 September 1947, at Tokyo. 23 24 "Signed, MIYAMA, Yozo." We next offer in evidence, if the Tribunal

please, ofense document 2614, being the affidavit of

3

6

8

9

11

14

15

16

13

17 18

19

22

21

24

Dr. KANZAKI, Masayoshi, one of the counsel for HATA.

By agreement with Mr. Sutton, in the second line the three words following the word "letter" will be omitted from the reading, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2614

will receive exhibit No. 3205-B.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3205-B and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS (Reading):

"Ever since HATA, Shunroku was arraigned, I have been his Chief Counsel.

"In order to obtain the letter demanding the resignation which was sent from the Chief of General Staff, Prince KANIN, to War Minister HATA, Shunroku in Jul 1940, I, since spring 1946, have requested the First Demobilization Bureau to take all measures possible to search for the letter but it could not be discovered. Further, with the assistance of Mrs. HATA and her son Shunpachi, I have searched HATA, Shunroku's house with the utmost of my power several times, but I could not discover it."

Signed, "KANZAKI, Masayoshi."

Lefler & Wolf

Now, if the Tribunal please, we very respectfully submit that with reference to exhibit 3205, the
affidavit of SAWADA, Shigeru, the defense has done
everything within its power to account for the absence
of the letter referred to on page 2, and we respectfully submit that we now should be permitted to read
the contents of that letter. I respectfully submit, sir,
that since we have accounted for the absence of the
original letter, the next best evidence is the person
who wrote the letter and delivered it to the accused
HATA. That is the best evidence we can possibly produce
today, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: We respectfully submit that the evidence falls far short of proving that the alleged letter from Prince KANIN to HATA is lost or destroyed and cannot be produced. The affidavit of MIYAMA, Yozo states only that the alleged letter could not be found in the files of the First Demobilization Bureau. The affidavit of Doctor KANZAKI states that he asked the First Demobilization Bureau to search for the letter, and that he caused a search to be made at HATA's home and he, Doctor KANZAKI, could not discover it.

The primary source of information, we respectfully submit, is the person who is alleged to have

•

received the letter. Nothing has been presented from him. There is no word or report from him as to what was done with the alleged letter or where it is at present. So far as this evidence discloses, the letter may be in existence and the defendant HATA may have full knowledge of that fact.

presented which would justify the Tribunal in changing its decision heretofore given, record page 29,015, for rejecting evidence as to the contents of the alleged letter.

MR. LAZARUS: In very brief reply, sir, I respectfully submit that the First Demobilization Bureau was the proper custodian of that document, had it still been in existence, and the affidavit of Doctor KANZAKI was an additional attempt on our part to convince this Tribunal that we have done everything in our power to find where that letter possibly could be. Although we know it couldn't have been in his home, we still searched there.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sustains the objection. You may not read the contents of the alleged letter from Prince KANIN to the accused HATA.

MR. LAZARUS: The next and last witness will be TANAKA, Ryukichi.

RYUKICHI TANAKA, recalled as a witness
on behalf of the defense, having been previous—
ly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters
as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. LAZARUS: I ask that defense document 2637
be shown to the witness.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.

BY MR. LAZARUS:

Q General TANAKA, is that your affidavit?

A Yes. Asserted to a soul of the law to the

MR. LAZARUS: By agreement with the prosecution we will omit question and answer No. 10, if the Tribunal please.

and with that exception, I offer into evidence defense document 2637.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, an affidavit containing substantially all of the statements in this affidavit was presented, record 29,031, and rejected with directions that it be withdrawn, record 29,037.

The present affidavit is subject to the same objections urged successfully against the first as

10

8

9

13

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23 24

containing the assumptions and conclusions of the witness.

We especially object to the questions and answers, numbers 4, 6 and 7, as argumentative and calling for and giving the opinions and conclusions of this witness as to the reasons for certain alleged action taken by General HATA.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: If the Tribunal will remember, and I am sure it does, the Chief Prosecutor suggested that the affidavit be recast and made more germane, which has been done.

The answers to 4 and 6 contain exactly the material contained in the previous affidavit, which paragraphs were among the few not objected to by the prosecution. The Tribunal will note that in both 4 and 6 the questions ask "Do you know..." and the answer each time is "I know..."

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court overrules the objection and admits the document.

will receive exhibit No. 2233.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2233 and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading)

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

1	"1. Q. Do you know the accused General HATA?
2	"A. Yes, I have known him very well since
3	December 1924 when I was working on the General Staff
4	and our relations privately and officially have been very
5	close.
6	"2. Q. Did you know General HATA during the
7	time he was War Minister in the ABE and the YONAI Cabinets
8	"A. Yes, I was Section Chief of the Military
9	Service Bureau in the War Ministry during that period.
10.	My duty was to supervise the actions of military personnel
11	and so I knew General HATA well and was very conversant
12	with the workings of the War Ministry.
13	"3. Q. What, if you know, was the position of
14	General HATA with reference to the proposed Tripartite
15	Pact.
17	"A. I know that General HATA was very
18	strongly opposed to it. In fact, it was very well known
19	in army circles that HATA strongly opposed the proposed
20	Tripartite Pact.
21	"4. Q. Do you know whether or not the army
22	agreed with General HATA's position with reference to
2	the Tripartite Pact?

"A. I know that the army were in favor of

the Tripartite Pact and because of HATA's opposition to

the Tripartite Pact, HATA was so strongly opposed by

24

7 8

those around him that his orders in the War Ministry
were not being obeyed. In fact, at the time of his fall,
General HATA was War Minister in name only because a
successor had already been decided upon in army circles.

"5. Q. How do you know that others in the War Ministry opposed General HATA?

"A. On the 14th of February 1945, I met General ANAMI and at that time he told me that he regretted very much the part he had played in opposing General HATA and in bringing about the resignation of General HATA as War Minister in the YONAI Cabinet and he also told me the details of the opposition within the War Ministry against General HATA. General ANAMI had been Vice Minister of War under General HATA in the YONAI Cabinet.

"6. Q. Do you know if there were any other reasons why the army opposed General HATA as strongly as you say you know they did?

"A. Yes, there were several reasons. The hatred and dislike of General HATA persisted from the day when he first supported the readjustment plan of the army when General UGAKI was War Minister and increased when he became War Minister in the ABE Cabinet, which Cabinet preceded the YONAI Cabinet. Two incidents served to heighten the hatred and dislike for HATA. The first

was that another man had been recommended by the Three Chiefs' Council to be War Minister in the ABE Cabinet but the Emperor ordered that HATA should become the War Minister and the post was given to General HATA. A further incident which served to aggravate the antipathy felt by those in high army circles was the following: General HATA was strongly opposed to the participation by army officers in politics and when he became War Minister for the first time, he addressed all the officers in the War Ministry Building. The gist of the speech was as follows:

"The present army is not trusted by the Emperor and it is the first duty of the army to endeavor to remover the Emperor's trust. In order to achieve this objective, all military personnel should absolutely cease any participation in politics and return to their regular duties of soldiering.

"7. Q. Can you give any example of HATA's enforcing the order of 'no politics' by War Ministry officers while he was War Minister?

"A. Yes, in 1939 when General HATA learned that a certain colonel made a speech in Sendai attacking the United States and England saying 'Down with those countries', he became indignant and ordered me to have that officer brought back to Tokyo. When I had him

brought back to Tokyo, General HATA reprimanded him and then transferred him to an outlying post as punishment.

"8. Q. While HATA was War Minister and you were a section chief under him, do you know if General HATA took any action with reference to the China Incident?

"A. Yes. In the fall of 1939 when HATA was War Minister in the ABE Cabinet, I began, under instructions from General HATA, negotiations with Chiang Kai-shek for a peaceful settlement of the China Incident. HATA told me that he wanted to bring about peace with China by the reduction and then the withdrawal of all Japanese troops from China. HATA told me that because of the opposition around him to his plan, we would have to work undercover and unofficially. General HATA gave me two points on which to work. One was to arrange the dates and place for the two messengers, one from HATA and one from Chiang Kai-shek, to meet, and the second was that the basis of the peace treaty would be the evacuation of all Japanese troops from China. HATA told me that while the negotiations were going on he would show his good faith to the Chinese by reducing the Japanese troops in China from 900,000 to between 500,000 and 600,000 when he made the next budget as War Minister, and I know that in his 1940 budget he did reduce the number of Japanese troops in China to approximately

*

25

23

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

600,000. However, there was great opnosition from within the War Ministry and the General Staff to any withdrawal of Japanese troops from China. It was insisted that Japanese troops should be permanently kept in the Shanghai and North China Areas. HATA epposed this. He stated that we must evacuate all troops from China. He stated that if we did not evacuate Japanese troops from China there would be absolutely no hope of concluding a peace treaty with Chiang Kai-shek The necessary negotiations with Chiang Kai-shek were so secret that at first the preliminary steps had to be carried out with signal codes. It was very difficult to convince the side of Chiang Kai-shek that a sincere attempt was being made to bring about peace. Gradually, however, they were convinced and come to believe that a peace treaty was possible and they started deciding on dates and places for future meetings.

Minister, was them of the fareful Staff and the

Princ Living to a later than the same to with all

ents and but the time appears not reconfirm from reach and

these war, certify he are the China goale, Engraphy

A. After Company INTERNAL Ran Seen that . Day

23

24

3

5

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

16

17

18

19

21

23

25

"11. Q. After General HATA became Commander of the Japanese Forces in China while you were still a Bureau chief in the War Ministry, do you know of any statements made or any actions taken by General HATA with reference to the Pacific War?

"A. Yes. In September 1941, when General HATA was commander in China and when relations between America and Japan were steadily deteriorating, General HATA sent his Chief of Staff, Lt. General USHIROGU, to Tokyo to see me and tell me that he, HATA, wanted to withdraw all Japanese troops from China in order to avoid a war with America. HATA asked me to help push this plan of his in the War Ministry.

"12. Q. Then what happened?

"A. General USHIROGU told me HATA had instructed him to go to the War Minister, the Navy
Minister, the Chief of the General Staff and the
Prime Minister and give the same message to each of
them.

"13. Q. Then what happened?

"A. After General USHIROGU had seen them, he came and told me the answers he received from each of these men, before he left for China again, to report to General HATA.

"14. Q. At any time while General HATA was Was Minister and while you were a section chief under him in the War Ministry, did the question of the use of Chinese prisoners in coal mines in Japan come up?

PA. Yes. In the spring of 1940, it was proposed to use Chinese prisoners in the coal mines of Japan. General HATA opposed it and as a result of his opposition the plan did not go into effect.

"15. Q. At any later period while you were still a member of the War Ministry as a section chief, did the question of use of Chinese prisoners in coal mines in Japan come up?

"A. Yes. In 1942, the question of using those prisoners in the coal mines of Japan again came up and General HATA who was then Commander of the Japanese Forces in China again strongly opposed the plan and because of his opposition the plan was not carried out.

were ever used in the coal mines in Japan?

"A. Yes. I know that in 1944 Chinese laborers were brought to Japan and it was through the Greater East Asia Ministry. General HATA had nothing to do with it and he did not have any control over it because the supervision of labor had already been

detached from army control and had come under the Greater East Asia Ministry."

Mr. Sutton.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SUTTON:

Q General TANAKA, what was the reply made by War Minister TOJO to the message from General HATA sent in by General USHIROGU?

A General USHIROGU said, after he met General TOJO, that TOJO had said that if America would accept the Japanese demands, then peace would be established -- would be secured between the two countries.

Q Did General HATA after 1939 become Commanding General of all Japanese forces in China?

A Yes.

Q You'state that he advocated in 1939 the withdrawal of troops from China.

A Yes, I do.

Q Did he, during the period from 1 March 1941 to 22 November 1944, extend the theater of military operations to comprise large portions of China?

A Yes.

Q And, did not the troops under his command in 1941 capture Fuchow, the capital of Fukien Province?

12 13

14

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

18

20

21

22

A Yes, that is so.

Q And, did they not capture Ichang?

THE MONITOR: What province?

MR. SUTTON: I-c-h-a-n-g.

A Yes.

Q And, did not the troops under his command, during 1942 and '43 and '44, in China, capture Lungling, Tunchung, Changteh, Chinchow, Loyang, Changsha, the capital of Honan Province, Hengyang, Kweilin, and Liuchow?

A Yes, just as you stated in your question, these places were captured.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, with regard to that portion of this affidavit which deals with the treatment of prisoners of war in China, questions and answers 14, 15, and 16, the prosecution respectfully draws the attention of the Tribunal to the following portions of the evidence concerning the treatment of prisoners of war in those portions of China under General HATA's command:

As to Hong Kong and that vicinity, exhibits 1590 to 1608 inclusive, record 13,162 to 13,185, and the testimony of Barnett, record 13,112 to 13,147;

As to Shanghai and other parts of China, the following exhibits: exhibits 1888 to 1896 inclusive,

record 14,158 to 14,172; exhibits 1900 to 1902 inclusive, record 14,178 to 14,184; exhibit 1904, record 14,186; exhibits 1907 to 1909 inclusive, record 14,188 to 14,190; exhibit 1911, record 14,191; exhibits 1914 to 1915 inclusive, record 14,194 to 14,195; and the testimony of Powell, record 3,270 to 3,280;

As to evidence that Chinese were brought by the Japanese army to Japan and forced to labor here, we respectfully refer to the testimony of Liu Yao-hwa, record 4,614-8, and the testimony of Ti Shu-tang, record 4,618-29.

That concludes the cross-examination of this witness.

25

MR. LAZARUS: No redirect, Mr. President.

I ask that the witness be excused on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was ex-

cused.)

MR. LAZARUS: If the Tribunal pleases, this concludes the evidence on behalf of HATA, Shunroku.

h

KAZUJI KAMEYAMA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, in reply to the objections of the prosecution to the testimony of this witness, KAMEYAMA, as contained in defense document 2464, I respectfully invite the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that this witness was an official in the Japanese Foreign Office during the period that the questions of the non-aggression pact and the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway were being considered. The affidavit clearly states, furthermore, that he was directly in charge of these problems and is therefore most qualified to testify on these matters.

THE PRESIDENT: But he relies on what he was told by others, and does not say who they were.

MR. YAMAOKA: I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that that is admittedly hearsay, but I do not understand that hearsay in and of itself is an objection.

The PRESIDENT: The source of the information should always be disclosed.

29,420

KAMEYAMA

MR. YAMAOKA: I believe if I may invite the Tribunal's attention to paragraph 3 of this affidavit it will be revealed that the deponent does set forth the sources of his information.

THE PRESIDENT: He speaks of "a certain superior official" in 4 and again in 8, and they are very important paragraphs. In 3 he does not use that phraseology.

MR. YAMAOKA: I respectfully submit, if the Tribunal please, that if there is any doubt on that, that could be elicited on cross-examination, and it only goes to the weight of this witness' testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: What an unknown person says has little weight as a rule.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal desires and will allow me, I shall ask this witness the sources of his information and knowledge.

THE PRESIDENT: There are other objections you had better deal with first, Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: Concerning the non-aggression pact, the Soviet prosecutor in support of counts of the Indictment stated, record 7,712 and 7,713, that the Japanese Government twice rejected the official proposals of the USSR to conclude a non-aggression pact and continued her hostile policies toward the

•

KAMEYAMA 29,421

USSR, and in support thereof offered in evidence prosecut...n exhibit 744, an excerpt from Litvinov's diary.

Mr. Furness of the defense objected to the introduction of this document on the ground that the refusal to sign a non-aggression pact does not prove any aggressive warfare or any plan of aggression.

The Tribunal, in overruling the objection, stated -- and I beg the indulgence to quote just a few short lines -- I quote: "Failure to agree to make a non-aggression pact, taken alone, would of course not be evidence of an intention to make war, but taken in conjunction with other circumstances it may reveal a state of mind in favor of war. I cannot say that it isn't relevant to any issue, to the issue of aggressive war or paration or conspiracy to wage it."

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, it is also claimed by the learned prosecutor that a lot of this document you are tendering is already in evidence. He gave us the number of four or five exhibits.

MR. YAMAOKA: I intended --

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear you further after the recess.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was

KAMEYAMA

```
tak n until 1100, after which the proceed-
           ings were resumed as follows:)
 3
 4
 5
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Greensers & Barton

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal,
I will continue dealing with each exhibit which was
mentioned by the learned prosecutor yesterday in support of his objection.

THE PRESIDENT: We read the exhibits, and we fail to see in these documents, or in this particular affidavit, anything that we do not already know except the details of the purchase of the railway which we think are of no real assistance.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I should desire to point out that at record page 7241 the Soviet prosecutor stated that the USSR was forced to sell the CER at a low price and tendered some of these exhibits in evidence in support of that charge. We now propose through this witness to show, first, that such sale was not forced; and I may add that we do have other evidence later on our order of proof which will substantiate that position, and that this discloses the part played by Mr. HIROTA in these negotiations as well as his lack of participation.

We respectfully submit that this is a very important matter on the question of whether or not Mr. HIROTA, by his acts or lack of participation, is

chargeable with the conspiracy which has been levelled against him. I do not believe, if your Honors please, that any of these exhibits, aside from 744, I believe, reveal any of the acts of HIROTA and his participation in these negotiations. Admittedly, some of them do cover the general subject matter, such as official notes and the sale contract, that is, an excerpt from it, et cetera.

As to the further objection that some of the testimony of this witness covers matters when the accused HIROTA was not in office, I beg to state that this period covered about eleven months, from the Fall of 1932 until September, 1933 when he became the Foreign Minister in the SAITO Cabinet. Thereafter, Mr. HIROTA was almost continuously in office until 1938. During the entire career of Mr. HIROTA the prosecution charges that he acted in furtherance of a conspiracy, if I understand the charge correctly. If that be assumed, then I respectfully submit that the acts of the Japanese Government during the brief period when he was out of office is still very material to show whether or not the accused, when he did at a later date continue in office or assume an official position, acted in furtherance of the conspiracy.

12

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

Now, as to exhibit 845, which is a verbal note delivered by the Foreign Minister, Count UCHIDA, to Ambassador Troyanovsky on December 13, 1932 showing the reasons why the Japanese Government at that time did not favor the conclusion of the Non-Agression Pact, the learned prosecutor yesterday stated that, while the affidavit of this witness in paragraph 11 states that the Japanese Foreign Office copies have been lost by fire during the war and cannot be found, the prosecution has produced the original thereof. I respectfully submit to the Tribunal that both statements are correct since a perusal of exhibit 745 clearly shows that it is the original supplied from Moscow, and this in no way contradicts the correctness of the statement by this witness as to the Japanese copy.

In the submission of the defense, it is respectfully submitted that the testimony of this witness as to the particular part played by Mr. HIROTA in these negotiations are relevant and material to the defense of the accused HIROTA and that his affidavit should be admitted in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal sustains the objections except as to paragraphs 1, 9 and 10 which are admitted on the usual terms. We

1 2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

invite the cooperation of learned counsel to keep the argument on objections within reasonable bounds. MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor. LERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2464 will receive exhibit No. 3234. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3234 and received in evidence.) constants of the deviat language lines

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

IR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3234 as admitted, omitting the formal part:

"(1). I entered the service of the Foreign Office in February 1922 and retired from office in March 1946. I held a post of the First Section, Bureau of European and American Affairs (afterwards Bureau of European-Asiatic Affairs) from February 1922 to March 1927 and from November 1930 to May 1935, taking charge of business concerning the Soviet Union. As to the problem of the conclusion of the Soviet-Japanese Non-Aggression Pact and the purchase of the East China ... Railway upon which I depose here, I was directly in charge of the business concerning them while I was in the above post. Further, I served at the Japanese Embassy : : Moscow first as a second secretary from May 1935 to November 1937, and then as a councillor from December 1942 to March 1945.

"(9) On May 2, 1933, Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov formally proposed to Ambassador OTA, who had succeeded Mr. HIROTA, to open negotiations for the selling of the East China Railway. The negotiation was started, as a result, on June 27, that year, at Tokyo, between the delegations of the Soviet Union and Manchukuo.

"(10) The crucial point of the negotiations

24 25

A read respect to the second .

en all a land of the land of a contraction.

was the question of the selling price of the Railway. The direct negotiations between the Soviet and Manchukuo d legations which dragged on for about one year were full of difficulty, and they often came to a standstill. To state the general progress of the negotiations, the Soviet side demanded, at the official conference of the beginning of July 1933, to receive 250,000,000 gold rouble -- that is, about 625,000,000 yen in Japanese money according to what the Soviet Government claimed to be the officially fixed exchange rate -- for the railway, and maintained that the retiring allowance for the Soviet employees of the railway company should be paid by the Manchukuo Government. Whereas, the Manchukuo side proposed to pay 50,000,000 yen for the railway. After that, the Soviet side pro-16 posed, at a comparatively earlier stage of the nego-17 tiations to reduce the selling price by 50,000,000 18 rouble. Further, in February 1934, it proposed to fix the selling price of the railway as 200,000,000 yen in Japanese money. On the other hand, the Manchukuo side proposed to raise the purchase price by 50,000,000 yen in April, that same year. And on July 23, after many disputes, Foreign Minister HIROTA suggested an intermediary plan that the selling price should be 120,000,000 yen and that the retiring allowance for the Soviet em-

ployees should be paid by the Manchukuo Government.

The Manchukuo side expressed its willingness to accept the plan but the Soviet side rejected, showing its own counter-plan of demanding 160,000,000 yen for the East China Railway. In this way, the negotiations between Manchukuo and the Soviet Union were brought to a dead-lock in August 1934.

"Hereon, conversations were held successively between Foreign Minister HIROTA in the capacity of an intermediary and Ambassador Yurenev of the Soviet Delegation, which progressed smoothly. And an agreement was attained in outline between the two, at the end of the year, resulting in the signing on March 23, 1935, of the Agreement concerning the East China Railway between Manchukuo and the Soviet Union, which contained stipulations that the selling price of the railway should be fixed at 140,000,000 yen and that the retiring allowance for the Soviet employees, 30,000,000 yen, should be paid by the Manchukuo Government."

Your witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

the two two to the to were to a more than which had

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to make some additional examination on behalf of the defendant TOGO.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

DIR ECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, at the time when you were for the first time in the Bureau of European-American Affairs, who was the section chief over you?

A Mr. TOGO was chief.

Q How long did he serve as section chief while you were in the section?

A For three full years, from 1923 to 1925.

Q During that period what important business occurred in the section vis-a-vis the USFR?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this class of question.

As I have always understood it, further examination by other counsel of a witness is confined, just as cross-examination is, to the subject with which he has dealt in his affidavit. The witness' affidavit is confined to the Chinese Eastern Railway negotiations in 1933 to 1935.

MR. BLAKENEY: If counsel's position be correct concerning the limitation on further examination, I point out that the witness testified that from 1922 to 1927 he was in a section which had charge of business concerning the Soviet Union. Of

19

18

21

22

23

-

'

course, I do not think there is or has been implied in this Tribunal any such rule of limitation on further examination in chief.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am not sure whether the point has arisen for decision. If not, I submit it now because, in my submission, the whole object or both of the two objects of testimony being given by affidavit would be defeated if such an extention is allowed: in the first place, the waste of time through what ought to be on affidavit being taken orally; and in the second place, the absence of notice as to the subjects to be inquired into.

As to my friend's reference to paragraph 1, that is merely the witness' career. He has given no evidence about anything that happened during that period.

MR. BLAKENEY: If counsel has concluded his second argument on the point, I should like to be permitted to finish. This very point has arisen within the week and has been ruled upon by the Tribunal. I am sorry that I cannot get from memory the the page reference, of course, or even the name of the witness, but early in this week, upon questions being put by Mr. Cole for General MUTO, objection was made by Mr. Sutton that the questions were with-

Raichers & Yelder

out the scope of the direct examination, which objection was overruled. Therefore, I submit that the objection comes too late if it have merit.

THE PRESIDENT: The matter is wholly one for the discretion of the Tribunal. Some Members may well think that the accused should not put their case piecemeal by wedging it in with the case or cases of other accused but should give all their evidence in their own case and recall the witness, if necessary. Others may think that because a witness is in the box he should say all that he has to say if it is, of course, not very extensive and such as not to call for another affidavit. That is a serious objection.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am entirely amenable to anything--

THE PRESIDENT: I think the position is summed up, as far as I understand it, in this way by a colleague: We have been in the habit of allowing direct examination by other accused providing the matter dealt with did not require lengthy treatment and was not a substantial evasion of the rule requiring service of affidavits. I cannot add to that.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am entirely amenable to any suggestion of the Tribunal. I thought this would

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

be expeditious; it may not be. further, Mr. Yamaoka? on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: If there is too much, many questions to put, perhaps you had better recall him with a fresh affidavit. MR. BLAKENEY: I will be very glad to proceed 50 . of the Chicag Manters Tailway were special THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Mr. Comyns Carr. MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the prosecution does not propose to cross-examine this witness but refers the Tribunal to exhibits 692 and 693 and particularly, with regard to the break in the negotiations for the Chinese Eastern Railway at the end of paragraph 10, to exhibits 748, page 7,739, and 749, page 7,742. The page reference for exhibits 692 and 693 is page 7,447 and onward. THE PRESIDENT: Do you want the witness any MR. YAMAOKA: May the witness be released THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in the light of the ruling in respect of the previous exhibit,

I withdraw the next document on the order of proof,

defense document 2553.

We now offer in evidence defense document 2509. This document shows the address made by the Soviet delegate at the first formal conference on June 26, 1933, at which time negotiations for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway were opened between delegates of the Soviet Union and Manchukuo. This document is designed to show the willingness, even eagerness, of the Soviet Union to dispose of that railway. Herein the Tribunal will perceive from at least one piece of evidence the absence of any pressure or coercion on the part of Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document which in its submission is irrelevant to the individual case of the accused HIROTA. It is a Russian note to the Japanese Government stating its willingness to sell the Chinese Eastern Railway at a time when HIROTA was not in office.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I stated previously that the Soviet prosecution charged that the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway was forced and at a low price and, I believe, HIROTA has been

charged with having undertaken official acts in connection with these negotiations in furtherance of the charge levied by the prosecution. While admittedly this document is dated prior to the time Mr. HIROTA was in office as Foreign Minister, nevertheless it is only a question of a few months antecedent thereto, and after he assumed office these negotiations were continued. In the light of the fact that this appears to be a charge of continuing conspiracy, in our submission this document is relevant and material as spowing whether or not the negotiations were forced upon the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

"Collection of the Publications in Connection with the Negotiation for the Purchase of North Manchuria Railway" will receive exhibit No. 3235 for identification only; the excerpt therefrom, being defense document 2509, will receive exhibit No. 3235-A.

(Whereupon, the pamphlet above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3235 for identification only; the excerpt therefrom, being defense document

2509, was marked defense exhibit No. 3235-A and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I read exhibit 3235-A:

"The First Formal Conference (June 26, 1933).

"Reply of the Soviet Delegate.

"Your Excellency.

"On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I wish to express my gratitude to the Imperial Japanese Government which has offered its good offices to act as intermediary in connection with a fundamental settlement of the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway and proposed that a conference be held in the Japanese capital regarding the sale of the said railway. The Government of the USSR seeks to carry out thoroughly its immutable policy of peace and its policy of promoting amicable relations with all nations, and it places special emphasis hereafter on furthering more and more the friendly relations with Japan which is an important factor in the peace of the Far East and of the world.

"In accordance with these policies, the Soviet Government, from the beginning of the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident, has given ample proof that it adheres to a policy of strict neutrality and absolute nonintervention, that it has due consideration

for the interests of Japan and at the same time strictly observes its obligations under reciprocal treaties, and that it is prepared to guarantee friendly relations with its neighboring countries on the basis of respect for mutual interests. The Soviet Government has on several occasions discussed methods of settling the Chinese Eastern Railway dispute with Japan which has pledged not to infringe upon the interests of the USSR in North Manchuria and which has expressed concern for the maintenance of peace and ord in Manchuria. Having due regard for the fact that recently the said railway might possibly become and actually has become the source of dispute among the USSR, Japan and Manchukuo and that certain influences opposed to peace have taken advantage of this fact and are seeking to aggravate Soviet-Japanese and Soviet-Manchukuo relations, the Soviet Government informed the Japanese Government that it is prepared to negotiate for a fundamental settlement of the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway by means of selling the said railway. Thus, the Soviet proposal is based on its constant desire to further its friendly relations with Japan and to secure peace. This is but another instance which shows the desire of the USSR for per . As stated in the speech of the Japanese

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Foreign Minister, Count UCHIDA, the Chinese Eastern Railway was constructed by Czarist Russia, which, by constructing this railway in the territory of another country, sought to attain its aggressive and imperj ialistic aims, but the Soviet Government does not, 6 nor can it, have such aims. The October Revolution 7 destroyed the signif cance of the Chinese Eastern 8 Railway as an instrument of imperialistic aggression. The Soviet Government changed this railway to a purely commercial enterprise and granted to the owner of (the country owning) the territory on which the said railway was constructed the right of joint management and division of its profits under the Sino-Russian Convention and the Mukden Agreement.

"However, the Soviet Government has taken the view, and still does, that it is its duty to protect its material interests concerning this railway which was constructed chiefly through the labor and capital of the Soviet people and which is the property of the USSR.

"As stated by Count UCHIDA, the Japanese Foreign Minister, the Chinese Eastern Railway possesses important international significance. That is to say, the said railway, even at the present time, plays a most important part in the international communication

21

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

Foreign Minister, Count UCHIDA, the Chinese Eastern Railway was constructed by Czarist Russia, which, by constructing this railway in the territory of another country, sought to attain its aggressive and imper-5 ialistic aims, but the Soviet Government does not, 6 nor can it, have such aims. The October Revolution 7 destroyed the signif cance of the Chinese Eastern 8 Railway as an instrument of imperialistic aggression. The Soviet Government changed this railway to a purely commercial enterprise and granted to the owner of (the country owning) the territory on which the said railway was constructed the right of joint management and division of its profits under the Sino-Russian Convention and the Mukden Agreement.

"However, the Soviet Government has taken the view, and still does, that it is its duty to protect its material interests concerning this railway which was constructed chiefly through the labor and capital of the Soviet people and which is the property of the USSR.

"As stated by Count UCHIDA, the Japanese Foreign Minister, the Chinese Eastern Railway possesses important international significance. That is to say, the said railway, even at the present time, plays a most important part in the international communication

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

between Europe and Asia and has significance as an important trunk line which links North Manchuria and the southern districts of Manchuria as well as the Pacific.

"In connection with the recent incident and the present situation in Manchuria, the deteriorating economic situation of the said railway will, of course, be improved with the future progress and economic development of Manchukuo. In view of the foregoing, therefore, the Soviet delegation has entered into negotiations for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway in order to secure our mutual friendly relations and to seek the enhancement of these relations in the future with prudence and sincerity necessary for a fundamental and effective settlement of the problem which has such important significance.

"It is our desire that the Manchukuo authorities, which recognized, in a note dated March 12th
addressed to the Soviet Government, all obligations
arising out of the Sino-Russian Convention and the
Mukden Agreement, will manifest equal sincerity with
a view to arriving at a harmonious termination of the
present conference.

"We hope that the negotiations which have commenced today will produce the expected results

through the positive and kind assistance of the Japanese Government."

There is a certificate attached which I will not read.

En Tiphicas To state endeavor of former

M. YARLOLD That It with regard to the

THE RELEGIES WATER AS AND TYPHICAL PROCESS.

page 7061 or the Fevore, which I have grantspally make

thered, that the name of the reliance of a life price.

nen I and debut recommend in the coders on thes subject

The Take Toport to want evidence, not here

was region on the Soulet Prices. I Waltere that I

6

1

2

3

4

5

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

ewe of ones there is nothing in the lociciments so

charge abulant your

for an even year, that would justify this type of

titings September and here it have the

THE PRESIDENT: Have you any further documents on that particular phase?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor, we do.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they may be repetitive
You don't need a large number of documents on this

MR. YAMAOKA: We shall endeavor to peruse the documents with a view to complying with the

particular point.

THE PRESIDENT: What evidence are you endeavoring to meet -- evidence of the prosecution?

Tribunal's wishes during the noon recess.

MR. YAMAOKA: That is with regard to the Chinese Eastern Railway, I take it?

THE PRESIDENT: What evidence containing any charge against you?

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, if the Tribunal pleases, the Soviet prosecution stated in its statement on page 7241 of the record, which I have previously mentioned, that the sale of the railway at a low price was forced on the Soviet Union. I believe that I can find other references in the record on that subject.

THE PRESIDENT: We want evidence, not mere assertions. There is nothing in the Indictment, so far as we can see, that would justify this type of evidence. You have to meet evidence, and evidence alone.

MR. YAMAOKA: The first statement made by your Honor is one with which counsel agrees. On the oth r hand, since the subject of the Chinese Eastern Railway has been brought forth by the prosecution for whatever purpose they may desire or see fit, and have charged that the sale was forced upon the U.S.S.R., we are obliged to offer proof that it was not.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission this is all based on a misreading of the passage which my friend quoted from the Soviet prosecutor's speech. The allegation was not that the negotiations for the sale of this railway were initiated as the result of any pressure or otherwise than voluntarily by the U.S.S.R. The allegation, which was supported by exhibits 748 and 749 which I just quoted, was that when in August 1934, as the last affidavit stated, the negotiations broke down, then pressure was applied by sabotage and ill-treatment of Soviet officials operating the railway in Manchuria to compel them to agree to the Japanese price. That was, of course, in the time of the accesed HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that in the Indictment? We must have it in the Indictment before we can deal with

MR. COMYNS CARK: Yes, of course.

THE PRESIDENT: We must have the allegation in the Indictment, plus the evidence supporting it.

MR. COMYNS CARE: There is no specific allegation about it in the Indictment, nor is it an important part of the evidence of conspiracy, but it is only as evidence of conspiracy and preparation that it was introduced. None of these documents deals with the real allegation at all.

THE PRESIDENT: In view of that clarification by Mr. Comyns Carr, Mr. Yamaoka, you may decide not to press a number of these documents.

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You will have an opportunity to review that during the luncheon recess.

We will adjourn until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, pursuant to the suggestion of the Tribunal just before recess regarding the withdrawal of certain documents dealing with the Chinese Eastern Railway, I have conferred with my co-counsel and have agreed to withdraw the following documents from the order or proof dated 23 September 1947:

No. 12, which is defense document 2167; No. 17, which is defense document 206-B-12; No. 22, defense document 2019, being that this is practically identical with exhibit 936; No. 39, being defense document 2219.

I have not had the opportunity to go any further then that during the noon recess, but at Monday's session I am quite sure we could make further announcements. I might add, also, if the Tribunal please, that of some of the documents which are still to be offered where there are references contained

11

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12 13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

therein to the Chinese Eastern Railway problem, we shall delete them from the reading.

We now offer in evidence defense document 206-B-2, which is a part of the affidavit of Ambassador Grew referred to in defense document 2468. This document, among other things, shows that Mr. HIROTA told the American Ambassador immediately upon assuming his first office as Foreign Minister his policy.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to part of this document. It does not object to part of the first paragraph down to the words, "as a complete surprise," that is, the end of the second sentence in the first paragraph. The remainder of the document, in our submission, is irrelevant as merely giving Grew's first impression of HIROTA, which is merely the opinion of Ambassador Grew.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I am quite agreed that the last paragraph of this excerpt is opinion, and I was not really going to read it.

I am prry. In introducing the document I probably should have mentioned it. However, as to the rest of the objection, we submit that, aside from the one sentence in the first paragraph stating the conviction

of Ambassador Grew, we, in our submission, believe that it is a statement reporting the conversation and that it is material.

THE PRESIDENT: Of what use is this to you?

Mr. Grew said that so far as he could see "one of
the chief impediments," et cetera, and the reply,

"We shall talk all that over." I can understand
your wanting to get in that sentence, "I am convinced
from his manner that he meant it."

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I believe that during the prosecution's case it was charged that many of these accused, and I believe even including HIROTA, had stirred up the public in the scheme of furthering a conspiracy to commit a war of aggression in violation of international law and treaties, and I believe also that there is ample proof in the record offered by the prosecution to the effect that the Japanese Government did try to control the press. Mr. Grew mentions in this excerpt the press as being one of the chief impediments to the good relations.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not trying the press, Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: But, if your Honor please, we shall later prove that Mr. HIROTA was very instrumental

·

in improving the tone of the press, in compliance with the expressed wishes of Mr. Grew, and this is excellent evidence on behalf of HIROTA to meet that part of the charge by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I suggest there is no connection between stirring up public opinion and the expression of views to the American Ambassador.

MR. YAMAOKA: In our submission, if your Honor please, this is an important item in the chain of proof on behalf of HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and admits only that part of the document not objected to, on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 206-B-2 will receive exhibit No. 3236.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3236 and received in evidence.)

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

"Received by HIROTA, the new Minister for Foreign Affairs, at 2. Amaral of Brazil was the only other ambassador there, Yurenev, the Russian, and

MR. YAMAOKA; I shall read this exhibit.

Auriti, the Italian, being either absent or late.

HIROTA received me with warmth, clasping my hands in both of his and in the course of our short talk he said that the cornerstone of his policy would be the

and that this, in fact, was the primary reason why he had accepted the appointment which had come to him as

development of better relations with the United States

a complete surprise."

We next offer in evidence defense document 2017, being an address of Mr. HIROTA, as Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the 65th session of the Imperial Diet on January 23, 1934. This document shows beyond doubt the peaceful policy sought to be pursued by Mr. HIROTA in relations with all foreign governments.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BRO'N: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. It is a statement for public consumption, and in view of the fact that there are a number of similar documents on the order to be submitted later, I wish to draw the attention of the Court to the argument which took place in this court,

reported on page 28,247, in connection with the admission of another document.

On that occasion, my learned friend, Mr. Comyns Carr, said: "These documents, which merely show that, for Western consumption, the accused made a number of specific or unexceptionable speeches, throw no light at all on the question of whether the other speeches and other writings and, in particular, the acts which the prosecution have proved, make out the case against him.

And on page 28,249, you, Mr. President, said:

"Without making any suggestion against the
accused, a clever conspirator would want to hide his
deeds and probably would express pious sentiment to
some people, especially to people publishing books.

For that very reason, self-serving statements were not
admitted in any national court. If they were, there
would be no limit to the amount of evidence that a man
charged with conspiracy could give of that kind. But,
I do not overlook the fact that the test is probative
value. It is a matter for us to decide."

In fact, your Honor, on that occasion the document submitted was rejected. On this occasion, your Honor, we submit that this document and a number of other documents on the order to be submitted later

come in precisely that category. It is a statement, a lengthy statement, that states the desire for peace with a number of specified countries, couched in such terms as to suggest, in our submission, that peace was to be on Japanese terms; the prosecution submits that this document is inadmissible and irrelevant.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe that it would be necessary to remind the learned prosecutor that even the prosecution has used many of the speeches of these accused in the Diet in support of their case. Furthermore, this statement in the Diet, while for public consumption, if one can say so, is not for that purpose alone. This important statement in the Diet probably influenced the course of action by that body in deciding upon many of its policies and actions.

Furthermore, we intend to prove that hotwithstanding the statements by the prosecution, the actual
acts performed by the accused HIROTA during the course
of his official duties actually coincided with the
statements he made in the Diet. These take the form
of telegrams and instructions and various conferences
with the ambassadors of many of the other powers; and,

therefore, in no sense can it be deemed what one would call a self-serving declaration.

In any event, these statements were made by Mr. HIROTA in his official capacity as Foreign Minister during the course of the alleged conspiracy, and in our submission is very material to the defense of his case.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2017 will receive exhibit No. 3237.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit . No. 3237 and received in evidence.)

To reside: There that Manchastas as a batch

Total god . our Scotte doors it specified to Vesport the

Consumedaning of the pay state and to microspec the

real time does become to the course that the sewitch of evil

In the law Year new per president of the entered to

neach thereas meanblister, the ther it render those

upar, top interpresent at the armsterness month of start,

17

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

wolf & Lefter

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YAMAOKA: I will now read exhibit 3237, omittin the title:

"I was in September last unexpectedly appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs. I have the honor today to speak on the foreign relations of Japan.

"The Japanese Government were obliged to serve notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations on the 27th of March last year, because the Manchurian Incident and the questions regarding the State of Manchukuo showed that there was no agreement between Japan and the League, on the fundamental principles of preserving peace in East Asia. At the time when the decisive step was taken His Majesty the Emperor graciously issued a Rescript, pointing out clearly and prec sely the path this nation should henceforth pursue. It reads: 'Now that Manchukuo has been founded, our Empire deems it essential to respect the independence of the new state and to encourage its healthy development, in order that the sources of evil in the Far East may be eradicated and an enduring peace thereby established.' Further it reads: 'However, the advancement of international peace is what, as evermore, we desire, and our attitude toward enterprises of peace shall sustain no change. By quitting

the Lear and embarking on a course of its own, our 2 Empire does not mean that it will stand aloof in the 3 Extreme Grient, nor that it will isolate itself thereby from the fraternity of nations. It is our desire to promote mutual confidence between our Empire and all the other Powers and to make known the justice of its cause throughout the world.' I am convinced that if we all unite in our endeavours to act in accordance with the wishes of our august Sovereign the world will surely come to realize the fairness and justice of Japan's position, and bright will be the future of our Empire. Personally speaking, in obedience to the Imperial message I am determined to use every ounce of my energy to 'carry out our national policy by diplomatic means in the interest of world peace. Portunately, today after our withdrawal from the League the commercial, as well as diplomatic, relations between Japan and the friendly Powers in general have become even closer and more cordial than before. I wish to avail myself of this occasion to dwell somewhat on the recent phases of our relations with those countries which are situated in our immediate neighbourhood.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

"Manchukou, thanks to the tireless labours of His Excellency the Regent, and of the government authorities, and also to the wholehearted assistance and collaboration extended to her by this country, true to the spirit of the Japan-Manchukuo Protocol, has been making steady progress along all lines of her constructive work. In ordering the various governmental institutions, especially in the maintenance of law and order, in the development of industry and communication, in the consolidation of national finance, and in the advancement of education and culture signal success has been achieved. Moreover, a decision is about to be made on the establishment of a monarchical regime, which has been so eagerly awaited by all her people, and which will go far to solidify the foundations of Manchukuo as a young independent nation. This is a matter of congratulation not for Manchukuo alone but for the peace of the Orient and the peace of the world. I think it behooves our government and people, always mindul of the Imperial Rescript, to exert their efforts unremittingly in assisting the healthy growth of the new state.

"The Japanese Government have serious responsiblities for the maintenance of peace in East Asia, and have a firm resolve in that regard. But what is most essential in the matter is the stabilization of China herself. Our government sincerely

9

20

1

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

authorities, and also to the wholehearted assistance and collaboration extended to her by this country, true to the spirit of the Japan-Manchukuo Protocol, has been making steady progress along all lines of her constructive work. In ordering the various governmental institutions, especially in the maintenance of law and order, in the development of industry and communication, in the consolidation of national finance, and in the advancement of education and culture signal success has been achieved. Moreover, a decision is about to be made on the establishment of a monarchical regime, which has been so eagerly awaited by all her people, and which will go far to solidify the foundations of Manchukuo as a young independent nation. This is a matter of congratulation not for Manchano alone but for the peace of the Orient and the peace of the world. I think it behooves our government and people, always mindul of the Imperial Rescript, to exert their efforts unremittingly in assisting the healthy growth of the new state.

"The Japanese Government have serious responsiblities for the maintenance of peace in East Asia, and have a firm resolve in that regard. But what is most essential in the matter is the stabilization of China herself. Our government sincerely

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

hope for the political and economic rehabilitation of They hope that she will be enabled to unite with Japan in performing the obvious mission of both Japan and China to contribute through mutual aid and co-operation to the peaceful development of their part of he globe. Unfortunately the actual situation of the present day China belies all such hopes. It has been reported that of late the Chinese Government, realizing the mistake of persisting in the anti-Japanese attitude, have decided to take steps looking toward the rectification of Sino-Japanese relations, but so far no concrete evidence has come to our notice to confirm the truth of the report. Should China appreciate our true motives and give tangible signs of sincerity on her part, Japan would be glad to reciprocate and meet her more than half way in a spirit of good will. It is gratifying to note that North China under the control of the Peiping Political Committee remains comparatively quiet. In view of the importa. ' rights and interests of Japan in that region and of its territorial contiguity with Manchukuo and also from the standpoint of the Tangku Truce Agreement the question of the maintenance of peace and order in North China is of special concern to Japan. She expects China to see to it that nothing will

3

6

8

5

9

10

11

13

15

14

17

16

18

20

21

23

25

happen that may bring chaos to that area. Meanwhile we are watching not without grave misgivings the activities of the Communist Party and the increasing rampancy of 'Red Armies' in China.

"Regarding Japan's relations with the Soviet Union it may be recalled that subsequently to the conclusion of the Peking Basis Treaty in 1925 normal contact was maintained between the two countries, and that even after the Manchurian Incident there was a thorough mutual understanding between the two Powers of their respective positions so that no difficult question was encountered. However, more recently the attitude of the Soviet Union toward Japan seems to have undergone a change of some sort. It is most surprisi and regrettable that the Soviet Union should take to now broadcasting at home and abroad through the press and other channels unwarranted criticisms directed against Japan, and circulate exaggerated stories about aggravations of this or that situation evidently for the political and diplomatic purposes which such rumours are calculated to serve. Japan has consistently preserved her fair and equitable attitude toward the Soviet Union throughout these years past before and after the Manchurian Incident. Despite the fundamental differences in both theory

and constitution of the state that divide the two countries, we have always endeavoured to keep on good neighborly terms with Soviet Russia and sought the solution of all questions by pacific means.

Especially since the establishment of Manchukuo, the Japanese Government have been acting solely upon their conviction that the proper adjustment of the tripartite relationship between Japan, Manchukuo and the Soviet Union was of paramount importance for the tranquillity of East Asia. Japan is setting up certainly no new military establishments along the Manchukuo-Soviet frontiers, Moscow propaganda notwithstanding."

I shall skip the balance of that paragraph and continue with the next.

"It may be definitely stated that between
Japan and the United States of America there exists
no question that is intrinsically difficult of
solution. Far from having any thought of picking a
quarrel with America, Japan fervently desires American
friendship. At the same time, I am confident that the
United States will not fail to appraise correctly
Japan's position in East Asia. Only for a time following the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident public
opinion in America was aroused against Japan, bringing
about something like temporary estrangement of the two

C: :

peoples. It is hardly necessary to reiterate that Japan is actuated by no ulterior motive other than her desire to establish an enduring peace in East Asia. Therefore, if only America will clearly perceive the actual condition of the Orient and realize Japan's role as a stabilizing force in East Asia, whatever emotional tension may yet linger between the two peoples is bound to disappear. I sincerely hope that the two great nations across the Pacific will, inview of their important relations, commercial and otherwise, continue to join forces in cultivating their historical friendship and good understanding so as to keep the ocean forever true to its name.

Empire remains unshaken even to these times. I believe the two sea Powers, occupying geographically similar key positions, one in the East and the other in the West, can effectually serve the cause of universal peace, through sympathetic appreciation of their respective stands and whole-hearted collaboration in all quarters of the world. It is in this sense that our government are seeking to readjust whatever conflict of interests relating to questions of trade there may be, and to strengthen further the ties of friendship that bind our empires. That our

. 25

negotiations with India, an important member of the British Empire, over knotty problems of commerce have now been substantially concluded is a source of gratification on both sides.

"Now a survey of the world as a whole reveals a sorry situation in which economic disorder, political unrest and confusion and conflict of ideas threaten to destroy international equilibrium at any moment, while mutual confidence of the nations in one another appears to have wilted not a little. I consider that no insuperable difficulties need be anticipated in settling any question if the nations manifest their sincerity and, with a true comprehension of one another's position, meet in a genuine and generous spirit of universal brotherhood. What is wanted is the abandonment of rootless jealousy and antagonism and the reinforcement of the sense of unity and mutual independence. However, international trade barriers, instead of decreasing, are fast multiplying. The World Economic Conference was forced to adjourn without having achieved the desired results. Of late our industries have taken marked strides with a corresponding expansion in our oversea trade, while, owing to the prevailing economic nationalism, one country after another has begun to set up fresh obstacles against the advance of

3

6

7

8

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

our export industries. Our government are making earnest efforts to deal effectively with the situation. Since mutual understanding of one another's unique national culture is of no small value in fostering good will between nations, our government are planning to take suitable measures in concert with private institutions for facilitating the cultural intercourse of our nation with the outside world.

"In the light of what I have already stated it is impossible for me to deny that our foreign relations are now, and will be in the future, beset with many serious problems. However, the path of a rising nation is always strewn with problems. As long as our people are united and well prepared to face courageously whatever difficulties may arise, and as long as we retain our composure and sobriety, and stray not from the path of rectitude, and in action always embrace the golden mean, I am confident that Japan has nothing to fear, and her future will be full of hope. We should not forget for a moment that Japan, serving as the only cornerstone for the edifice of the peace of East Asia, bears the entire burden of responsibilities. It is this important position and these vast responsibilities in which Japan's diplomacy and national defenses are rooted. Our national defense is

.

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

organized in its very nature for defensive and selfprotective purposes. At the same time our diplomacy has no claims to put forth save what is legitimate and rational and consonant with our national mission. That eventually this position, in which Japan naturally finds herself, will be rightly understood by 6 other Powers is, I believe, a foregone conclusion." 7 There is a certificate attached, if your 8 on Feing seraly reportables of pare of 9 Honor please. 10 THE LOSS CHARTS AND ASSESSMENT 11 in thunes. If the friends clease, this 12 tion from the Papertal Wast street, that is, the 13 14 or version Minister Wilder, shows has whose in 15 the Caramena distant for sunitive measures inst 16 17 ar year to the objection is beertuied and 18 Springer sanifted on the usual heres. 19

Terral to men person defense under her 3038

Talk Tar 1 2001 read exhibit 3258, emitting

20

22

24

We next offer in evidence defense document 2152. It is taken from the official minutes of the proceedings of the House of Peers at the 65th session of the Imperial Diet on February 7, 1934, and reveals the answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA to a question with respect to the attitude toward conditions in China.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as being merely repetitive of part of exhibit 3237, which has just been read.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, this quotation from the Imperial Diet speech, that is, the answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA, shows his views in spite of the Japanese cries for punitive measures that had been raised.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2152 will receive exhibit No. 3238.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3238 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I will read exhibit 3238, omitting

the title:

7

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"Answer of the Minister of State (Mr. Koki

"In particular, finally, with regard to the Chinese question, since the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident there have been considerable difficult problems for Japan. However, I believe that the relation between the two countries is no casual matter but, be it good or bad, it is destined for the Japanese people to improve this relation down through generations. Times were, depending upon the attitude of the Chinese politicians and the idea of the masses, when these were anti-Japanese and resist-Japan activities, while on the Japanese side cries for punitive measures have been raised, but these are all passing phases, and from a long range view the two countries are destined to be friendly. As I intend to cope with the Chinese question with this fundamental belief, it is hard for me even to imagine that trouble will occur between Japan and China."

We next offer in evidence defense document

206-B (10). This document, among other things, shows
that Mr. HIROTA was "personally an influence more peaceful than bellicose." That he had "displayed", as Foreign
Minister, "unexpected strength and was personally largely
responsible for the milder tone of the press and for a
new orientation" in developing "better relations with

20 21

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

foreign countries." We a majority the count sugar

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. It expresses merely the opinions of Ambassador Grew. Even if that were not an objection, the only part of the opinion which is relevant to the defendant HIROTA is the part, the whole of which my learned friend has just read in presenting the document.

In fact, your Honor, he misread one part of it.

It is at the beginning of the second paragraph. He said "HIROTA" where it is, in fact, "The Prime Minister."

That is the only part which refers at all to HIROTA that is opinion. That, we submit, is inadmissible because it is merely opinion; and the rest for that reason and also because it is irrelevant.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I quite agree with my learned friend. There was a misquotation here in my running commentary on "Prime Minister." and I regret the oversight.

On the other hand, in answer to the objection, we beg to submit that this is a proper piece of evidence which should be admitted by the Tribunal.

I might mention that I only intend to read the first paragraph and the first three sentences of the second paragraph.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sus-

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, may I take this epportunity to protest again against the practice, which is becoming common with defense counsel, of using a running commentary as a means of reading in advance the part, or sometimes even the whole of a document, before its admissibility has been decided by the Tribunal. The effect is that even when the document is rejected, its contents are used for propaganda purposes. And, in my respectful submission, steps should be taken to put a stop to it.

THE PRESIDENT: I wish you would suggest what steps, Mr. Comyns Carr. We must trust counsel up to a point. I agree with you that some of the commentaries are very long, and unnecessarily so. We could, of course refuse to allow any commentary unless requested by the Court itself.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I am sure my learned friends have sufficient respect for the Tribunal to obey any warning which the Tribunal may think fit to give on this point.

THE PRESIDENT: I have many times given that warning on behalf of the Tribunal. Most counsel have

1 observed it.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Yamaoka, I know you are reading material prepared for you, but I do hope that Monday at all events, if you are still here on this matter, you will be able to read shorter commentaries.

I do not think the purpose is propaganda, but to enable us to hear the thing twice. I think it will stick better if it is heard twice.

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall try to comply with the wishes of the Tribunal.

We offer in evidence defense document 1365.

This is an important document showing that on February

21, 1934, Mr. HIROTA sent to America a personal message
in an effort to improve the relations between the two
courtries. The document also contains a reply of Mr.

Hull.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document which is divided into two parts: The first part, that is, the message sent by HIROTA, because it is a mere repetition of the evidence already contained in exhibit 174 at page 1806, which contains Mr. Cordell Hull's substantially similar account of this occurrence.

The second part, which is Mr. Cordell Hull's message in reply, is, in our submission, irrelevant to

the case, the individual case of HIROTA, at all events.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we are quite willing not to read the message of Mr. Hull and confine ourselves to the message to the American Secretary.

of State.

Insofar as exhibit 174 is concerned, a perusal thereof shows that this speech was mentioned in this exhibit, and I do not believe that its contents have been read into the record.

MR. BROWN: Perhaps I ought to clarify that, your Honor.

At page 1806 an account, a synopsis of this note, is given by Mr. Cordell Hull. In our submission, this synopsis gives a sufficient account of the contents of this message containing all the essence of it. This do ment merely repeats the message in full, which, in our submission, is unnecessary and adds nothing to the useful information at the disposal of the Court.

MR. YAMAOKA: I hope that I am not mistaken, if the Tribunal please. I have this exhibit 174 before me and the part which was read into the record, as mentioned by my learned friend, but I see that only a very few words from this proposed exhibit, that is, this document 1365, was quoted.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained as regards Mr. Hull's message, but otherwise the document is admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1365 will receive exhibit No. 3239. (Whereupon, the document above re-ferred to was marked defense exhibit 3239 and received in evidence.)

Y 2 d & K 6 pi 7

e

a

u

3

4

5

8

9

17

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MR. YAMAOKA: I will now read exhibit 3239. I shall omit the headings.

"February 21st, 1934."

"It is a significant fact that ever since Japan and the United States opened their doors to each other exactly eighty years ago, the two countries have always maintained a relationship of friendliness and cordiality.

"It is a matter for gratification to both our countries that they produce very few commodities which represent conflicting interests in their foreign trade, that each supplies what the other wants, that they are good customers of each other's products and that they are strengthening their relation of interdependence year after year.

"I firmly believe that viewed in the light of the broad aspect of the situation and studied from all possible angles, no question exists between our two countries that is fundamentally incapable of amicable solution. I do not doubt that all issues pending between the two nations will be settled in a satisfactory ... inner, when examined with a good understanding on the part of each of the other's position, discussed with an open mind and in all frankness, and approached with a spirit of cooperation and conciliation.

19 20

21 22

23

"I can state with all emphasis at my command that the Japanese nation makes it its basic principle to collaborate in peace and harmony with all nations and has no intention whatever to provoke and make trouble with any other power.

"It is the sincere desire of Japan that a most peaceful and friendly relation will be firmly established between her and her great neighbor across the Pacific, the United States. And to this end I have been exerting my best efforts since I took the post of Foreign Minister.

"I am happy, therefore, to avail myself of the occasion of the arrival in your country of Mr. SAITO, the new ambassador, to lay before you, through him, Mr. Secretary, my thoughts as to the necessity of promoting our traditional friendship as above.

"I hope and believe that the desire of the

Japanese Government in this respect will be reciprocated
by a full support and countenance on the part of your

Government."

This is a statement made by Mr. HIROTA in proceedings of the Committee of the Budget of the House of Peers at the 65th session of the Imperial Diet on February 23, 1934.

7 8

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as merely repetitive of exhibit 3237 that was read earlier this afternoon -- merely repetitive of part of that exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I am quite aware that many of these answers of the accused HIROTA in the Imperial Diet do appear repetitive.

THE PRESIDENT: This appears to be repetitive,
Mr. Yamaoka. Where an accused has made a speech in the
Diet on a relevant matter, we are inclined to admit it;
but this is really repetitive.

MR. YAMAOKA: However --

THE PRESIDENT: Do you wish to be heard further?

MR. YAMAOKA: May I be heard for just a moment,
if your Honor please? In our submission these Diet
speeches or answers to interpellations may in some instances appear to be repetitive. However, they do show
and disclose a course of conduct by the accused HIROTA
and they do relate to matters before the Imperial Diet
and probably affected matters deliberated by that body.
Therefore we are willing, if the Tribunal will permit,
the offer of these documents into evidence without the
reading of many of them. That will, I am sure, assist

the Tribunal by not laboring it more than necessary with these details.

> THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution does not agree to that suggestion. In our view, the document is either admitted or not admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: The document will be admitted only if relevant and material and not repetitive.

A majority think this document is repetitive. They sustain the objection and reject the document.

MR. YAMAOKA: "e next offer in evidence an excerpt from the book of Ambassador Grew entitled "Ten Years in Japan," being defense document 206-B(13). We intend to read the first two sentences of the second paragraph, on page 1, and the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 2.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, even in that emasculated state the prosecution objects to this document as irrelevant to the individual case of HIROTA, who is not mentioned except to state that the Soviet ambassador was negotiating with him about the Chinese Eastern Railway, which is repetitive. It is a statement by the Soviet ambassador, and in the submission of the prosecution is inadmissible.

24

2

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in our submission this document, that is, the portions thereof which we desire to read into the record, are clearly relevant and material and proper evidence before this Tribunal. The Soviet prosecution has charged that mer of the accused prepared for aggressive war against the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: The only sentence that really appears to be of any value is that in which HIROTA is referred to. It is the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 2.

MR YAMAOKA: The first excerpt, if your Honor pleases, discloses the state of affairs in the Soviet Union which the Japanese were obliged to meet, and we believe the proof of this will substantiate the defense that there was no conspiracy to commit an act of aggression against the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained except as regards the last sentence in the first pragraph on page 2. I shall read it and it will relieve you of the necessity of doing so.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 206-B(13) will receive exhibit No. 3240.

(Whereupon, the document above

)

referred was marked defense exhibit 3240 and received in evidence.)

HE PRESIDENT (reading): "He" -- that is,

Mr. Yurenev, the Soviet ambassador -- "agreed with me
that important pacific influences are at work in Japan,
including the Emperor, Prince SAIONJI, Count MAKINO,
a considerable body of liberal opinion, and especially
HIROTA, but he added that in the last analysis the
decision would lie with the military."

MR. YAMAOKA: May I now call the witness KU-

THE PRESIDENT: Well, swear him in.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The witness is now in court. He has testified previously.

	[2] 4일 (1) [2] [2] 4 [2] [2] 4 [2] [2] 4 [2] [2] 4 [2] 4 [2] 5 [2
1	KAZUE KUWASHIMA, recalled as a witness
2	on behalf of the defense, having been previously
3	sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters.
4	as follows:
5	THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former
6	oath, Witness.
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. YAMAOKA:
9	0 Will the witness kindly state his name and
10	address?
11	A My name is KUWASHIMA, Kazue. Presently I re-
12	side at 365 Tamagawa, Todoroki, 3 Chome, Setagaya-ku,
13	Tokyo.
14	MR. YAMAOKA: May the witness be shown defense
15	document 2145?
16	(Whereupon, a document was handed
17	to the witness.)
18	Q Is that document your affidavit and are the
19 20	contents thereof true and correct?
21	A Yes.
22	MR. YAMAOKA: I now offer in evidence defense
23	document 2145.
24	(Whereupon, Mr. Comyns Carr took a
25	position before the lectern.)
	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr, we will deal

with the objection after the recess.

1 2

2

3

4

e 6

G

n 7 b 8

g 9

& 10

B 11 a r 12

o 13 n 14

> 15 16

> > 17

18

20

21

23

24

(Whereupon, at 1430, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MAPSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, prosecution objects to certain parts of this affidavit.

First, the last sentence of paragraph 3 which is merely the witness' opinion; then the whole of paragraph 6 which is merely the witness' opinion about the opinion of other persons, unnamed, in Japan; next, paragraph 7, the last three sentences which are merely statements, the source of which is not disclosed as to the intentions of Mr. Wang and Mr. Chiang Kai-shek and their actions in China. I beg the Tribunal's pardon: the last three sentences of the second part of paragraph 7 which are remarks alleged to have been made by certain unnamed military officers.

We object to the whole of paragraph 9 and 10 on the ground that no source is given as to how the witness comes to know about what took place at a conference at which he doesn't say that he was present.

Paragraph 10, the first part, the same

objection; and the second part, the objection that it is entirely based upon two documents which are not produced or accounted for in any way.

Also to the first portion of paragraph 11 which is merely the witness' opinion or what he calls the Foreign Office's opinion about the undisclosed contents of the unproduced documents; and to the last of that paragraph and to the whole of paragraph 12 on the ground that without production of those documents the contents are immaterial; and to the second portion of paragraph 12 in which the witness purports to state the attitude of various unnamed Chinese persons to certain proposals of Mr. HIROTA, and that Mr. Chiang Kai-shek is said, by some unnamed person, to have said something.

Finally we object to the whole of paragraphs 16 to 22 -- that is, to the end of the affidavit; no, to nearly the end of the affidavit: 16 to 22, inclusive -- on the ground that they deal entirely with certain negotiations said to have been undertaken by Mr. ARITA. We have been served with notice of an affidavit by Mr. ARITA in this case, and he has already testified in others, and if these matters were material the proper person to testify to them is Mr. ARITA himself and not this

witness, in our submission, especially as the witness, from time to time in the course of the document, professes to state Mr. ARITA's opinion about various matters.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, with respect to the first objection of the learned prosecutor in paragraph 3, page 1, the last sentence, we are quite agreeable to deletion thereof.

As to many of the paragraphs objected to on the ground that the documents have not been produced and that the affidavit contains matters relating to such documents which have not been produced, we wish to state that this witness was Director of the Bureau of Asiatic Affairs during the period when Mr. HIROTA was Foreign Minister and later Prime Minister.

As to the objection that Mr. ARITA should testify as to many of the matters mentioned in this affidavit instead of this witness, I wish to state that Mr. ARITA was Foreign Minister under Mr. HIROTA when he was Prime Minister. Therefore, in that capacity it must be presumed that he bears some measure of responsibility. However, in so far as this witness attempts to testify to matters which were within the knowledge of Mr. ARITA, I believe that in his position

1

18

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

20

23

24

had ample opportunity to know the facts and he could disclose his source of information and his knowledge on cross-examination. Moreover, he does state in paragraph 2 of this affidavit that Mr. HIROTA did speak to this witness about many of the matters testified to.

Now, in so far as paragraph No. 7 is concerned, that is, the last three lines of the second part of paragraph — the last three sentences beginning "At that time," we, in our submission, deem this relevant and important for the reason that it discloses a cleavage in the branches of the two services; and Mr. HIROTA continued to act in accordance with the pronouncements and declarations made by him in the Diet and in his statements to foreign governments notwithstanding such opposition.

As to the further objection that many of the documents about which this witness testifies are not being produced, I desire to state that in the order of proof and have many of the documents which will support the statements of this witness, and we intend to introduce them at a later stage.

MR. COMYNS CARR: But not, as far as I can trace, the documents to which I particularly objected,

in paragraph 10.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I am informed 1 my associate that defense documents 2216, 2217, 2218 and 2219 do cover the points mentioned in paragraph 10; not all, perhaps, but the substantial portions of this paragraph to which objection has been taken.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, my friend is misinformed. 2218 is a speech by HIROTA in the Diet. 2219 is one of those which my friend has withdrawn and has nothing to do with this subject. 2216 and 2217 are telegrams. None is either of the plans mentioned in paragraph 10, nor do the dates in any sense correspond.

I was wrong about 2218. That is another telegram which mentions one of the plans in question, but it isn't the plan nor does it centain its centents.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are sustained and the document rejected to the extent objected to.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in order that I may not make an error in the reading of this document when so many objections have been interposed, may I be permitted a few moments to check these deletions?

24

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2145 1 will receive exhibit No. 3241. 2 (Whereupon, the portions not ob-3

jected to in document No. 2145 were marked defense exhibit 3241 and received in evidence.)

7

4

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

prointed Director of the Bureau of Adlatic Science 8 Chairs after Jule 1934) in August 1933, resisting.

edingry and Minister Floring to the Boston

Works from June 1987 to Decomber 1998, and Pricey De-

was Jackey 1919 to Popular 1940. I relieve fine

control of Thintein in August 1933. The Shen Bernise manufaction wis femal MATDA. On Sentunber le, Missis esse

manyo at the thory though Winlind need most on the graking

of 171 books, and he, Mintel successed his as Carving Winsards, The regulations to bear a Joseph and Chillip Es

woll do there believed during now the Marters Congre water

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read defense exhibit 3241, noting the omissions, and omitting the formal part:

"I entered the Diplomatic Service in October 1908, and after holding posts in China and the United States as well as in the Foreign Office at Tokyo, was appointed Director of the Bureau of Asiatic Affairs (which changed its name to the Bureau of East-Asiatic Affairs after June 1934) in August 1933, remaining in that office till January 1937. I was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands from June 1937 to December 1938, and Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Brazil from January 1939 to November 1940. I retired from office onuary 1941.

"(2) I was transferred to the office of Director of the Bureau of Asiatic Affairs from consulgeneral at Tientsin in August 1933. The then Foreign
Minister was Count UCHIDA. On September 14, about one
month after that, Count UCHIDA resigned on the ground
of ill health, and Mr. HIROTA succeeded him as Foreign
Minister. The relations between Japan and China as
well as those between Japan and the Western Powers were
gloomy and oppressive at the time of Foreign Minister
Count UCHIDA, owing to the Manchurian incident. Above

1!

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

all, the diplomatic relations between Japan and China were, in effect, half broken off, though ministers were still exchanged between them. And it was the firm resolution of Mr. HIROTA upon assuming the office of Foreign Minister to alleviate the oppressive tension attending the Sino-Japanese relations. Mr. HIROTA in person told me that very frequently. Besides, he made statements before the newspapermen to the same effect. At the Diet also, he made it clear that his policy aimed at alleviating the tense relations between Japan and China. People called the diplomacy of Count UCHIDA 'the burnt ground diplomacy', and that of Mr. HIROTA the conciliatory diplomacy.

"(3) Mr. HIROTA carried out his resolution steadily in every sphere of Japan's foreign relations. The Ambassador to China, when Mr. HIROTA assumed the office of Foreign Minister, was Mr. ARIYOSHI, Akira, a veteran diplomat, eager for the rapprochement between Japan and China. He had exerted all his efforts in alleviating the tense relations between the two countries, but could not attain the desired object easily. After the outbreak of the Manchurian incident, it was true that the Chinese, in and out of office, were prone to avoid to associate with Japanese, and such circumstances worked as important restraint for

R eich er & Y eid

> 24 25

17 18

19

20

21

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the activity of Minister ARIYOSHI."

that mean a witch of the Anifoldia Wash com-

"(4) The attitudes of the Nationalist Government towards Japan began to change considerably from the beginning of 1934, owing to the efforts of Minister ARIYOSHI. It resumed, for instance, the payment of several private loans which had been suspended since the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident, though in a small scale. Meanwhile, Minister ARIYOSHI opened conversations with Mr. Wang, Ching-wei, the then Home Minister and Foreign Minister of the Nationalist Government, upon the radical improvement of the Sino-Japanese relations. This ARIYOSHI-Wang conversation progressed considerably speedly. Mr. Wang at first maintained, at this conversation, that the settlement of the Manchukuo question was the requisite condition for the general improvement of the relations between Japan and

already recognized it, and that any Government, if

China. Minister ARIYOSHI, however, explained that the public opinion in Japan would not allow the Government to retract the recognition of Manchukuo since Japan had

22

23 24

25

there be any, which would venture to do that, would find it difficult to exist even for one day. Mr. Wang seemed to understand the awkward position of the Japanese Government, The Nationalist Government, however, had

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to give consideration to the public opinion in its own country and the main subject of the ARIYOSHI-Wang conversation thereafter, accordingly, lay in how to harmonize the difficult and contradictory standpoints of both Governments with respect to the Manchukuo question. The documents concerned are said to have been lost in the fire during the war. But the telegram No. 368, under date of April 20, 1934, addressed to the Foreign Minister from the consul-general at Nanking, which miraculously escaped fire, is a precious material reporting the contents of the ARIYOSHI-Wang conversation of April 18.

"In this way, the efforts of Foreign Minister HIROTA to improve the Sino-Japanese relations appeared much hopeful in 1934.

"(5) On April 17, 1934, when the negotiation for the improvement of the Sino-Japanese relations between Japanese Minister to China ARIYOSHI and Chinese Foreign Minister Wang had hardly been opened there arose a question of the so-called unofficial statement of spokesman AMO."

May I here state that this name is spelled AMO but I believe the correct spelling is AMAU, and I desire to have that correction in the name throughout.

"At that time, Mr. Monnet, an expert financier

23 24

of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, was staying in China from the end of 1934. The Foreign Office
frequently received information from the Japanese
Legation at Nanking and other sources that Mr. Monnet
was drafting a plan for international cooperation to
China, from which Japan was to be excluded, in concert
with those entagonists of Mr. Wang, Chin-Wei. The
Foreign Office, thereupon, instructed the Japanese
Linister to China and other officials to keep in touch
with Mr. Monnet and discourage him so that his activity
in China might be restrained. Telegraphic instructions
to the same effect were frequently given to the Japanese
representatives in China from the Bureau of East-Asiatic
Affairs, in which rather exaggerated expressions were
used with a view to impress Mr. Monnet strongly.

man AMAU to the newspapermen was a patchwork of the contents of those telegraphic instructions drawn up for such special purpose by a certain bureau of the Foreign Office. And this, when reported by the press as if it had been the policy of the Japanese Government, gave rise to public discussion.

"According to what I was told by Foreign
Minister HIROTA at that time, he had nothing to do with
that unofficial statement of Mr. AMAU before it was

,

published and he reprimended him because of that statement."

* *

"(7) Foreign Minister HIROTA emphasized his policy for the rapprochement between Japan and China as well as his confidence in the Nationalist Government all the more in his address delivered at the Diet on January 22, 1935, and also in his statement made at a committee afterwards. He declared, at a committee, that he had not the slightest doubt about the sincerity of Mr. Chiang, Kai-shek, in his exertion for the betterment of the Sino-Japanese relations, and aroused public attention. On the other hand, Mr. Wang, Chin-wei, and Mr. Chiang, Kai-shek, expressed their intention in response to the above-mentioned statement of Foreign Minister HIROTA. From that time on, the Nationalist Government resumed the control of anti-Japanese movements in real earnest. The trade between the two countries, which had been stagnant since the outbreak of the Menchurian Incident, regained its activity.

"Early in May, the Foreign Minister in person took the initiative to submit to the Cabinet conference the question of raising the Japanese and Chinese Legations in China and in Japan respectively to the status of Embassies. This passed the Cabinet conference, and

3

4

1

2

7 8

6

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

the Nationalist Government agreeing to the proposal, the raising of the status of the Legations was decided between the two Governments on May 17. The exchange of ambassadors between Japan and China had been advocated by those pro-Chinese for a long time, but at the end of April when Minister ARIYOSHI returned to Japan to make previous arrangements with the Government, the rumor was already abroad that it would be realized."

. * *

The situation in North China had been

Agreement of May 1932, at Tangku. But it began to change at the beginning of 1935. Especially after May, when the Legations were raised to Embassies, various matters occurred suddenly. My memory is not quite unfailing about the particulars of those old occurrences but there occurred frequent skirmishes from May or June onward, between the Kwantung Army and Chinese forces, near the border between Jehol and the provinces of Hopeh and Chahar -- such remote and out-of-the-way places where no official from the Foreign Office was stationed. The Kwantung Army, and sometimes the North China Stationary Force, would lodge protests directly with the Chinese Government on all such occasions, on the ground that such were provocative acts on the part

of the Chinese Government. They would impose considerably strict conditions such as, for instance, the withdrawal of Chinese forces from the above-mentioned provinces or the extermination of the Kuomintang branches in Hopeh and Chahar, and enforced the fulfillment of & these conditions with an ultimatum. The Chinese Government regarded these as systematic plots designed by the Kwantung Army or the North Chine Stationary Force on small occurrences or some intentionally caused troubles. We were not so credulous as to believe everything that the Chinese Government pleaded, but still we could not but recognize that our military authorities in China were prone to raise a storm in a tea cup. It was our earnest hope that they should act more prudently, and we actually warned them against such destructive attitudes."

I shall now skip to the second paragraph of (12):

"Those envoys had hardly returned to Tokyo before various troubles arose in succession in China in defiance of the new policy. I have forgotten the particulars about those cases. But to cite several remarkable instances, the Chi-tung Regime was established, demanding self-government against the rule of the Nationalist Government, at the end of November,

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

20

22

24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

in the unfortified zones established by the Tangku Truce Agreement, that is, in the border between North China and Manchuria. The Foreign Office had a suspician that this regime had a close connection with the Kwantung Army. In November, the Foreign Office received information that the Kwantung Army was concentrating its mechanized troops at Shanhaikwan with a view to intimidating North China: The Foreign Office warned the Army against the fact.

"And again, in the middle of December, the Chi-cha Administrative Committee was formed. The Foreign Office suspected that the Japanese military authorities in China had a hand in the organization of that Committee. This Committee, however, had correspondence with the Nanking Government and was admitted by the latter to enjoy a certain degree of independence within the limit that it did not overshadow the sovereignty of the central Government.

20

19

21

22

23 24

"The Foreign Office was against the establishment of the Chi-tung Regime. The smuggling in
North China caused by the exceedingly low tariff
rates of the said Regime was a matter greatly disadvantageous to Japan, even judged exclusively from
the viewpoint of trade with China. I negotiated
directly with the Kwantung Army concerning the matter,
and inspected the actual circumstances of smuggling,
when I was despatched to Manchukuo and China by
orders of the Foreign Minister ARITA from the beginning of June to the beginning of July.

"Towards the Chi-cha Administration Committee, however, the Foreign Office took rather different
attitudes. Though the Foreign Office had nothing to
do with the formation of the said Committee, the
consuls stationed in these areas used to deal with
it, after they learned that it had correspondence
with the Nanking Government, being formed with its
approval.

ness and decimal the Petholphop on Optober 5 of the

the pregrat public for the first time. But the Covern

processing year, 1835, or I have started before. It

sed shortly after that thet Foreign Williams HIROYA

broade the Three Printielss to thinks askessofur

"(13) Meanwhile, the negotiations for the improvement of the Sino-Japanese relations made steady progress and attained the realization of the exchange of Ambassadors between the two countries in May, 1935. The national sentiments of China, however, seized this opportunity to take a turn unfavorable for Japan. In November and December, the situation got considerably serious. Mr. Wang Ching-wei, who had shown such zeal for the rapproachement between Japan and China, barely escaped assassination, in November. And his most faithful friend and cooperator, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Tang Yu-Jen, was assassinated in December. Such a change of the national sentiments in China was due, I considered, to the activities of the Japanese military against North China.

11 * * ×

"(14) It was through Foreign Minister
HIROTA's address delivered at the Diet on January
21, 1936 that the Three Principles were let known to
the general public for the first time. But the Government had decided the Principles on October 4 of the
preceding year, 1935, as I have stated before. It
was shortly after that that Foreign Minister HIROTA
showed the Three Principles to Chinese Ambassador

0

18

1

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

'

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

Chiang Tsuo-Pin. The above-mentioned opinion of Mr. Chiang Kai-shek was revealed to our Ambassador ARIYOSHI in response to this.

"Shortly after the official announcement of the Three Principles, the so-called February 26 incident broke out in Japan. The OKADA Cabinet collapsed, and Mr. HIROTA received an Imperial mandate to form a new Ministry."

I skip to (23).

hope upon the future development of the negotiation, when there broke out the so-called Suiyuan Incident owing to the activities of a part of the officers of the Kwantung Army in Inner Mongolia. The attitude of the Chinese Government towards the Sino-Japanese negotiations also underwent a sudden change. It went as far as to disapprove the results of the past negotiations on the pretext of the Suiyuan Incident. The negotiation was brought to a standstill and no further progress was made in spite of all the efforts on the part of the Japanese Government to urge it.

"The Diet was to open in the middle of January of the following year. Judging from the political standpoint of the then Government, it was considered to be untoward to leave the negotiation as it was at a deadlock. The Foreign Office was thus compelled
to close the negotiation, except that for the settlement of the Chengtu and Pakhoi Incidents upon which
perfect understanding had already been reached between
Japan and China.
"The HIROTA Cabinet resigned en masse in

"The HIROTA Cabinet resigned en masse in January, 1937. I also resigned the office of the Director of the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs, and then was transferred to the post of the Japanese Minister to the Netherlands."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. YAMAOKA: I understand that there will be further examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, do you know who was commander of the Japanese North China Garrison in the spring of 1935?

A I think it was Lieutenant General UMEZU.

Q You have stated in paragraph 8 of your affidavit that from 1935 the Kwantung Army and the North China Garrison began to have troubles with the Chinese over border incidents and that protests were lodged

2

11

13

7

8

9

10

14

16

17

18 19

20

23

23

24

directly with the Chinese by these armies. In that connection I want to ask you whether you know of any border incident or border skirmish of the spring of 1935 which was participated in by the North China Garrison?

Counsel, were clashes, small clashes, which occurred around the borders between Jehol Province and Chahar and Hopeh Provinces between the Kwantung Army units and Chinese troops, and negotiations pertaining to these clashes were conducted principally by the Kwantung Army. However, I have been told that at times the Japanese military attache in Peking and at times the Tichtsin Army assisted in the negotiations—the Tientsin garrison; and so I have used in my affidavit rather general terms to the effect that the matter was handled by the Tientsin Army or the North China Garrison.

Q Among these instances which you mention of direct negotiation with the Chinese by Japanese forces, do you include the instance of the so-called Ho-UNEZU . Agreement?

A I included the Ho-UMEZU Agreement in the general negotiations. I do not particularly include this with regard to negotiations pertaining to border

2.

3

.

7

8 9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

clashes.

Q In fact, it did not come about as a result of a border clash, did it?

A No.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May I ask if this is further examination or cross-examination?

THE PRESIDENT: I have been taking it as cross-examination in view of the statements in paragraph 8 involving UMEZU.

MR. BLAKENEY: Such was my opinion.

Q As a result of what did the Ho-UMEZU Agreement come about?

A It was in connection with the assassination of a pro-Japanese newspaper man residing in the Japanese concession in Tientsin.

Q Now I should like to ask you whether the instance of the Ho-UMEZU Agreement was one of those instances which you referred to as having been enforced by the imposition of an ultimatum?

A In my recollection I think it was as a result of a considerably strong demand but I do not think that it had a time limit.

Q What did you learn at the time concerning the circumstances in which the so-called Ho-UMEZU - Agreement was entered into?

A At that time when the Commanding General, UMEZU, was about to leave for Hsinking or for some other place his chief of staff told him that in his opinion, that is, in the opinion of the chief of staff, a rather friendly and moderate warning should be given and to this General UMEZU is said to have replied, according to the information I received at that time, that if that was the case it would be excellent.

Q Do you remember the name of that chief of staff?

A I recollect it as having been Colonel SAKAI.

MR. BLAKENEY: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: It is hardly worth starting a fresh examination at this hour. We will adjourn until half-past nine on Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 29 September 1947, at 0930.)